



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the clergy, nor by kings, nor by the people, can it be judged. . . . These wretched men do not consider that the words they so earnestly preach are either the words of Popes extending their borders, or the words of those who flattered them; and because such words are easily answered,\* they run immediately to the Gospel, and interpret the words of Christ, not as the sense of the holy spirit requires, but by their own fancy. They chiefly rely on this, that it was said to Peter—‘thou shalt be called Cephas,’ by which they make him head of the Church; ‘I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven;’ and ‘whatever thou shalt bind on earth,’ and ‘I have prayed for thee, Peter, that thy faith fail not;’ and ‘feed my sheep;’ and ‘cast thy net into the deep;’ and ‘fear not, from henceforth thou shalt catch men;’ and that Christ commanded Peter alone, as prince of the apostles, to give tribute for himself and for him; and that Peter drew the net to land full of great fishes; and that Peter alone drew his sword in defence of the Church; all which things these men, in an astonishing manner, set up on high, the expositions of the holy doctors being altogether disregarded.”†

And *Aeneas Sylvius* goes on to say—“Seeing the Pope is Vicar of the Church, no one doubts that a master may, at his pleasure, turn off his vicars; nor is there any doubt that the Pope is more truly called the Vicar of the Church, than the Vicar of Christ;‡ and elsewhere, ‘whatever some men say, I cannot agree with those who call the Pope the Head of the Church, unless, perhaps, a ministerial head;§ for we read that Christ is Head of the Church, not the Pope.’”||

We take this passage as a fair statement of the views of a very large party, including even whole nations and churches in the Church of Rome.

For *Aeneas Sylvius* wrote this in defence of the Council of Basil.

That Council of Basil, in its second session, about the year 1432, had renewed a decree formerly made in the General Council of Constance, in these terms—

“This Synod, lawfully called in the Holy Spirit, and constituting a general Council, and representing the Church militant, has power immediately from Christ, to which every one, of whatever state or dignity, even though it should be the Papacy itself, is bound to obey in those things which relate to faith, or to the extirpation of the aforesaid schism, or to the general reformation of the Church of God, in its head and in its members.”¶

And in their 32nd session the Council pronounced this decree, which makes the Council without the Pope supreme, and binds the Pope to obey it, to be “a verity of the Catholic faith.”\*\*

This decision of the Council of Basil has been, of course, condemned as heretical at Rome; and the decree of the Council of Constance, which the Council of Basil only confirmed, has always been reprobated at Rome, although the

\* If our readers will look back to our number for January, 1854, in the article “Forged Decretal Epistles,” No. II., page 3, columns 1 and 2, they will find that the two things which *Aeneas Sylvius* reports to be cried out by the supporters of the Pope in his day—viz., “that the Roman Pontiff is reserved to the judgment of God alone,” and that “neither by the emperor, nor by all the clergy, nor by kings, nor by the people can he be judged,” are both taken from the forgeries of the middle ages, and have no other foundation. *Aeneas Sylvius*, who was a really learned man, might, therefore, well say, that these things could be easily answered. But our readers will be surprised when they come to the end of this article, and learn by whom these things, so easily answered, were again set up.

† *Oportet omnium mortuorum est, si opinio vocari debet que idoneis confirmatur autoribus, quia Romanus Pontifex universali ecclesie subjectus existit; neque hoc viventes negare audent. Audent illud autem, apud aliquos revocatur in dubium, an id quoque de general concilio credi oporteat. Sunt enim aliqui, sive adivi glorie, sive quod adulando proxima expectant, qui peregrinans quasdam et omnino novas praedicare doctrinas cuperunt, ipsimque summum pontificem ex jurisdictione sacri concilii demere non verentur. Excedavit namque illos ambitio, a qua non solum hoc modernum, sed omnia usque ad hanc diem schismatis, suborta reperientur.* . . . . Hodiernam haeresim illi precipue nutrunt, quos jam mendicare suppedit, quorum alias clamat, subditorum facta judicari a Papa, Romanum vero Pontificem solus dei reservari auctoritatem. Alius dicit, quia primam sedem nemo iudicabit, quod neque ab Anzusto, neque ab omni clero, neque a Regibus, neque a populo valcat iudicari.

‡ Nec considerant miseri quia quae praecant tantopere verba, aut summorum Pontificum sunt sua fimbrias extendentium, ant illorum qui eis adulabuntur.

Et quia hujusmodi dicta solutionem habent, recurunt statim ad Evangelium, et verba Christi non prout spiritus sancti sensus exposcit, sed suopte ingenio interpretantur. Plurimumque illud extollunt, quia Petrus sit dictum, tu vocaberis Cephas, per quod illam caput ecclesie faciunt: *Tibi dabo claves regni Colorum: et quoniamque illos ambitio, a qua non solum hoc modernum, sed omnia usque ad hanc diem schismatis, suborta reperientur.*

§ *Hodiernam haeresim illi precipue nutrunt, quos jam mendicare suppedit, quorum alias clamat, subditorum facta judicari a Papa, Romanum vero Pontificem solus dei reservari auctoritatem. Alius dicit, quia primam sedem nemo iudicabit, quod neque ab Anzusto, neque ab omni clero, neque a Regibus, neque a populo valcat iudicari.*

¶ *Nec considerant miseri quia quae praecant tantopere verba, aut summorum Pontificum sunt sua fimbrias extendentium, ant illorum qui eis adulabuntur.*

*Et quia hujusmodi dicta solutionem habent, recurunt statim ad Evangelium, et verba Christi non prout spiritus sancti sensus exposcit, sed suopte ingenio interpretantur. Plurimumque illud extollunt, quia Petrus sit dictum, tu vocaberis Cephas, per quod illam caput ecclesie faciunt: *Tibi dabo claves regni Colorum: et quoniamque illos ambitio, a qua non solum hoc modernum, sed omnia usque ad hanc diem schismatis, suborta reperientur.**

|| *Quia cum sit Papa vicarius ecclesie, nemo dubitat quin Dominus vicarius possit ad nutum suum destituire; nec dubium est, verius dici Papam ecclesie vicarium quam Christi.* —P. 15.

¶ The expression “ministerial head,” means no more than “head servant.”

¶ *Quicquid tamen dicant alii, ego cum illis non sentio, qui Romanum Pontificem caput ecclesie dicunt, nisi forsan ministeriale; legimus enim, quia Christus est ecclesie caput, non Papa.* —P. 15.

¶ *Ipsa Synodus in spiritu sancto legitime congregata, potestatem immediate a Christo habet, cui quilibet cuiusque status vel dignitatis, etiam si papalis existat, obediens tenetur in his quae pertinent ad fidem, et extirpationem dicti schismatis, et ad generalem reformationem ecclesie Dei in capite et in membris.* —Labbe and Coss., Con. Gen., vol. xii., col. 477.

\*\* *Veritas de potestate concilii generalis, universalem ecclesiam representantis, supra papam et quemlibet alterum, declarata per Constantiensem, et hoc Basilicensem Generalia Concilia, est veritas fidei Catholicae.* —Labbe and Coss., Con. Gen., vol. xii., col. 619.

Church of Rome expressly acknowledged the General Council of Constance as a general council, and infallible!

But the French Church has always acknowledged what was thus decided at Constance and Basil to be true and right. This is the main point of what is called the “Gallican liberties.” And though the Gallican doctrine for the last few years has seemed to be forgotten in France, yet it is now rapidly reviving; and the Archbishop of Paris is known to be in favour of it. And this is what the *Tablet* meant (Dec. 23, p. 809), when it exclaimed in a rage against “the new sprung veneration for Bossuet;” for Bossuet was a famous French bishop who ably supported the Gallican liberties.

So the defence which *Aeneas Sylvius* wrote at the time for the decree of the Council of Basil, may well be taken as expressing the sentiments of a large party in the Church of Rome, which exists to this day.

But we come now to the other view of the spiritual supremacy of the Pope, which is, perhaps, the one generally advocated in Ireland at this day, though it was far from being so general fifty years ago. In this case, too, we give the statement from a great authority, Pope Pius II.

#### NO. II.—POPE PIUS II.

“As cranes follow one; as among bees, one is queen; so in the Church militant, which is like the Church triumphant, one is the ruler and judge of all; from whom, as from THE HEAD, all power and authority is derived to the subject members, which power flows immediately to him from Christ the Lord our God. Nor truly has Christ chiefly imparted supreme authority to any other as the leader of his army, except to his own vicar, who first was Peter, to whom we have known that the care of the Lord’s flock was committed. Nor do the evangelists make mention of two or more Peters, nor did the Lord institute two or more, who should hold his place as equal heads; but he appointed one, as the head, and leader, and pastor of the universal flock, Simon Peter, saying—‘Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church; and I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven;’ and ‘feed my sheep.’ Which things are read to have been specially said to no other but Peter, so that unity and the highest authority is contained in Peter. Nor is any other but Simon called Peter, from the rock (*Petra*); that we might understand that Simon Peter is the only one who holds the place of that true and solid rock—that is, of Christ, as Paul expounds it; who alone drew his sword for his master when exposed to danger. Peter, therefore, and his successors, the Roman pontiffs, held the primacy in the Church. . . . And whosoever is set over the Roman Church, according to the canonical rules, as soon as he is elected in the sacred college, obtains supreme power immediately from God, and diffuses it in order through the whole Church, whose sins are to be left to be punished by the divine judgment.”

And again, “Whoever has sat as chief priest of Rome, rightly appointed in the legitimate way of election, called by God like Aaron, all people, all kings, all clergy, all bishops have venerated him as the vicar of Jesus Christ, and the successor of blessed Peter, the head, and ruler, and leader of the universal Church.”

We ask our readers to mark carefully how contrary these two statements are to each other.

1. *Aeneas Sylvius* says it is *not* the Pope, but Christ, who is the head of the Church. Pius II. says the Pope is the head of the Church.

2. *Aeneas Sylvius* says the Pope is only the Vicar of the Church, and not the Vicar of Christ. Pius II. says the Pope is the *Vicar of Christ*.

3. *Aeneas Sylvius* says the Pope is subject to the Church. Pius II. says the Pope is ruler of the Church.

4. *Aeneas Sylvius* says that the Pope may be judged by a general council, and that it is heresy to deny it, or to say that the Pope can be judged by God only. Pius II. affirms that the Pope can be judged by God only.

5. *Aeneas Sylvius* ridicules the attempt to prove the supremacy of the Pope out of the passages commonly

\* *Sicut Grues inam sequuntur; et in apibus unus est rex; ita in ecclesia militanti, quae instar triumphantis halie, unus est omnium moderator et arbitrus, Iesu Christi vicarius; a quo, tanquam capite, omnis in subjecta membra potestas, et auctoritas derivatur, quae a Christo Domino Deo nostro sine medio in ipsum infuit. Nec protectio in aliis, tanquam sui exercitus dicem, supremam auctoritatem Christi principaliter derivatur, quam in suum vicarium, qui primus fuit Petrus, cui communias novimus dominici gregis curam. Ne duos plures Petros evangelistas commemorant, nec duos aut plures institutus dominus qui suum locum tanquam capitam tenerent aequalia; sed unum constituit, ut verticem ac ducent et pastorem universi gregis, Simonem Petrum, dicens: Tu es Petrus, et supra hanc petram edificabo ecclesiam meam; et tibi dabo claves regni colorum, et quoniamque ligaveris super terram, erit ligatum et in celo; et quoniamque soleris super terram, erit solutus et in celo. Et pasce oves meas. Quae nulli alteri seorsum dicta leguntur, nisi Petrus, ut in Petro unitas et summa continetur auctoritas. Nec aliis a petra dictus est Petrus, nisi Simon; ut intelligeremus unicum esse versus et solidum Petrum, id est Christi (ut Paulus exponit) locum tenet, Simonem Petrum, qui solus pro domino in pericolo constituto exemit gladium. Petrus igitur, et successores ejus Romani Pontifices primatum in ecclesia tenerunt.* . . . . Et quoniamque Romana secundum canonicas sanctiones prefector ecclesiae, quoniamprimum electus est in sacro collegio, supremam a Deo potestatem sine medio consequitur, et per ordinem in omniem diffundit ecclesiam, eni peccata. Divino iudicio priuenda relinquuntur. —Labbe et Coss., Con. Gen., vol. xiii., col. 1408-9.

\*\* *Qui Roma sederit antistes rite institutus per legitimam electionis tramitem, tanquam Aaron vocatus a Domino, hunc omnes Christianos plebes, omnes populi, omnes reges, omnes clericos, omnes episcoli tanquam Iesu Christi vicarium, et benti Petri successorem, universalia ecclesiae caput ac rectorem ac ducentem venerati sint.* —Idem, col. 1,414.

quoted about Peter, and especially that one, which does look a poor proof, of Peter having drawn his sword. Pius II quotes all these passages, the sword included, to prove the supremacy of the Pope.

Thus it appears how opposite are the two views of the spiritual power of the Pope, which have each been so widely held in the Church of Rome.

That these views are, in fact, so opposed, that one must be rejected in order to hold the other, is very plainly shown by Pius II. himself, who emphatically says—“*Aeneas rejicit, Pium recipit*”—“REJECT *AENEAS*, AND RECEIVE *PIUS*.”

Our readers will, perhaps, be surprised to learn (and we trust their surprise will be instructive as well as amusing) that *Aeneas Sylvius* and Pope Pius II. were the same man! But so it was. As *Aeneas Sylvius* (before he was Pope) he exposed the extravagant claims made for the Popes, and said that these were only the words of “Popes extending their own borders,” or the words of those who flatter Popes. But when he himself became a Pope extending *his own* borders, and listening to his own flatterers, then he could find nothing to prove his own claims by, except the very arguments which formerly he had said were “easily answered!”

Here, then, we find the Roman communion itself quite divided about the extent and nature of the Pope’s spiritual power. One large body of them leaving him hardly any; another large body maintaining that God has given *all* power to the Pope.

Either Popes have been falsely usurping spiritual powers which God never gave them, or millions of Roman Catholics have for ages been denying and disputing the powers which God gave to the Pope.

We trust that the statements we have given of the two opposite opinions, both given under such different circumstances, by one who was a wise and learned man, will help our readers to judge which opinion has the most honest foundation, and which has rested on usurpation and flattery.

#### RECENT CONTROVERSY AT BOULOGNE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

(Continued from page 33.)

SIR—I think it scarcely fair to the pressure upon your limited space, and to the excellence of your other contributions, to trespass any longer upon the pages of the *Layman*, especially as the account of this controversy already given is quite sufficient to show the mode in which it was conducted. I shall, therefore, with your permission, conclude with the present number, unless some reason may subsequently occur to show the continuation to be desirable.

The discussion was mainly confined to the question of infallibility. I had proposed it because, as it is the doctrine upon which the whole claims of the Roman Catholic Church really rest, I felt that being the most important doctrine, it was that one which its advocates were supposed to be best capable of defending. I, on the other side, felt assured I could show it to be impossible of proof. Thus the subject was one not only the most important, but, likewise, that which Roman Catholic controversialists should be most willing and best able to establish. I declared myself content to rest my whole cause upon the proof of this doctrine.

My own argument was, in fact, just that which any one who maintains infallibility ought, if that doctrine be true, to be able most easily to answer, because it was simply an examination of the steps necessary to prove it—noticing more.

It is evident that the main support of the doctrine is the passage—“Thou art Peter,” &c. Therefore, because it is, in the judgment of Romanist writers, their strongest text, I was ready to rest my case on it, as I should have been on any other.

Roman Catholics have never yet decided whether it be the Church, or the Pontiff, or both, who are infallible.

This indecision is, of itself, sufficient to show how little really can be made from the passages of Scripture alleged in proof. However, though my two opponents disagreed on this very essential point, we entered upon this text as a proof of papal infallibility and jurisdiction.

Now, it is clear that in order to establish the doctrine from it (or from any other which speaks of Peter), three distinct steps are indispensable, or the claim falls to the ground. It must be shown—first, that this passage (or any other) does really convey, or promise, infallibility or supreme jurisdiction to Peter; secondly, that the same prerogatives are declared to be continued to his (presumed) successors; and, thirdly, that such successors are, *solely*, the Roman Pontiffs. If any of these three separate propositions be incapable of clear proof, the whole claim is destroyed. I felt sure that each of the three was thus incapable.

Now, then, for the *first* of these steps (the same mode of argument applying, of course, to all). I put the question, and I believe the difficulty—*how* do you propose to prove it? There are but three modes of proof—infallibility, private interpretation, or the universal consent of the Fathers.

The first of these must be set aside, since it cannot be assumed for proof of itself. The second is subject to all the uncertainty which, according to the Roman Catholic doctrine, attends and invalidates it.

The only available medium of proof then is, what the

Roman Catholic Church asserts it possesses, the universal consent of the Fathers.

I then put the simple question—produce now plain statements which show that the Fathers did really interpret this text as conveying infallibility and jurisdiction to St. Peter. Give me nothing else than proof of what you assert—that they really did concur in your interpretation.

I should suppose I was here only putting the question just in the very way in which a Roman Catholic, if this claim be true, would wish me to put it. It is clearly the most direct way of testing a valid proof.

I need scarcely say no advocate of that Church has ever yet stood this test. Their whole argument here is the common sophism of *ignoratio elenchi*. They produce extracts which prove not this fact, but something else which they hope may be mistaken for it. On the other side, the Protestant controversialist need only, because of the claim made to *universality* of consent by his opponents—a claim which, be it well remembered, they are forced to make—produce a single accredited writer who interprets the passage in a different sense. Your readers can judge whether the quotations made from the Fathers were relevant or not. To assume infallibility when called on to prove it is, *a petitio principii*. The argument from the Fathers is, as used by Romish writers, an *ignoratio elenchi*. These are the two great sophisms of the Roman Catholic Church in its attempted proof of the cardinal doctrine of infallibility.

On the other side, when, as the only chance left, private judgment is used as an interpreter, the Protestant controversialist is enabled to urge an unanswerable *argumentum ad hominem*.

My opponents, as other advocates of their Church, endeavoured to escape from this difficulty by asserting, that upon the Protestant principle of interpretation their claim could be made out. To this I replied, as any one would, such mode of proof is not, upon your own principles, open to you; you contradict them in using it. You have, however, really no option in the matter, and must, at last, whether you like it or not, come to that mode of proof, though, in doing so, you prove both your own inconsistency and the truth of the Protestant principle, which you affect to decry.

It will be observed that, as yet, we were but upon the first step of the argument—namely, the proof that the Fathers did unanimously interpret the words—“Thou art Peter,” &c., as conveying infallibility and jurisdiction of power over the whole Church of God to Peter. Whether all, or even one among them all, did explicitly so say, can be easily decided by any person who considers even the passages which Romanist writers, and my opponents, adduce as the strongest.

But, now, let us suppose they did with one voice do, what not one among them did—interpret the passage, as giving these prerogatives to Peter. Yet, there is then the question—Were those prerogatives held to be transmissible? were they not personal to Peter? even allowing this passage (or any other) to speak at all of infallibility and jurisdiction.

How can it be proved that these privileges (allowing them to be contained in those words) were intended by the Lord to be transmissible to any line of men.

This was the second step of the proof indispensable to be made out by Roman Catholic controversialists, or the claim fails.

To this second step I applied just the same test which I had already applied to the first. You cannot use your infallibility for that interpretation; nor can you employ your own judgment. You have nothing left but the universal consent of the Fathers. Therefore, produce now extracts from their writings by which it shall unmistakeably appear that they did, with one voice, declare their belief that this passage did say those privileges of infallibility and jurisdiction were *hereditary*.

I added here, I desire to direct your attention strongly to this, because I consider it to be the real strength of my argument.

The controversy was here brought to a sudden and very unexpected termination.

Mr. Gretton said—We may go on for ever at this rate. I shall take a course which you may possibly think Jesuitical. I say the passage does convey that meaning; you assert it does not. I shall assert the direct reverse of anything you maintain. How, then, can we end? I replied—This is to surrender your case as incapable of proof. It will bring the discussion at once to an end. Mr. Gretton refused to give any other answer.

I grieve to say, that the young lady on whose account I had, though an entire stranger to me, undertaken a long journey, and a very unpleasant controversy, here interposed, and said—“You have engaged in this controversy on my account, I demand, therefore, that you change your mode of proceeding. You must, I insist on it, give up your attack, and show to me some ‘better way’ than that of the Catholic Church.”

To this I answered—“That ‘better way’ is in the Church you have quitted. But I now warn you of what you are doing. You have interfered at the most essential part of my argument, as I have declared this to be. You are striving to shield your own advocates from certain defeat. Is it not utterly unreasonable of you to demand that I should, as I certainly shall not do, give up what I conceive to be the right mode of proceeding, and adopt a bad one?”

Notwithstanding this, the young lady persevered in her demand, and Mr. Gretton in his refusal.\* I, therefore, said—So far as I am concerned, this controversy is ended. I am ready to defend the Church of England at the proper time; but I will not be turned aside at the crisis of our discussion to do so. If Mr. Gretton persists in his refusal, he terminates the controversy. I shall then be ready to defend the doctrines of the Church of England.

The following are briefly the objections made—

Mr. Langdon endeavoured to show the Church of England not to be a true Church, because she did not come up to the conditions of a Church in Ephesians iv.—“One Lord, one faith, one baptism.” He said, Protestants, differing among themselves, had not “one faith.” That Mr. Gorham, the Bishop of Exeter, and the Archbishop of Canterbury differed about *baptismal regeneration*! therefore, the Church of England had not “one baptism.”

The answers are, of course, very plain—

As to “one faith,” he was confounding the articles of the Established Church with the opinions of individuals on subjects not determined by the articles. The faith of the Church of England was manifestly “one,” being always in accordance with that of the Church of Christ, derived solely from the Bible, concentrated in the creeds, and maintained in the four great general councils. The Church of Rome, by his own argument, could not be the true Church. It had not “one faith.” Its articles differ from those of the primitive Church. No early creed contained them; yet the creeds were the accredited summaries of faith. Pius IV. added new articles. The Church of Rome admitted that communion in one kind was neither the doctrine nor practice of the primitive Church. The immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary was a plain novelty. The faith of the Romish Church, among all Churches, had the least title to be one.

As to “one baptism.” If Mr. Langdon can get any one to agree with him in translating *εν βαπτισμῷ*, “a community of view as to the doctrine of *baptismal regeneration*,” his argument might stand—but not till then.

Mr. Langdon read extracts from various writers against the Church of England, and in favour of Rome: among them from Mr. Macaulay, who, in a well-known passage, says—“She may still exist in undiminished vigour when some traveller shall take his stand on a broken arch of London Bridge to sketch the ruins of St. Paul.”

To this I replied—Opinions of men are not to be considered as doctrines of the Church of England; that it would be easy to produce numbers of Roman Catholic writers who spoke of the corruptions of the Church of Rome; that as to Mr. Macaulay, it was easy to neutralize the passage which Mr. L. had read, by producing another from the same writer, in which he speaks of the debasing influence of the Church of Rome, as now constituted, in terms of strong condemnation. I then read the striking passage, which declares that the transition from a Roman Catholic country to Protestant may be known from the different appearances of each; that, for the last three centuries, “to stunt the growth of the human mind has been the chief object of the Church of Rome.”

Mr. Langdon’s reply to this was—That the passage I had quoted referred only to temporal things; that Protestants looked to them, and did advance in civilization! that he could not but admire the goodness of God, who had given some comforts to Protestants in this world, seeing *they would have none in the world to come!*

Mr. Gretton then endeavoured to convict the Church of England of a contradiction. In her catechism she said, “the body and blood of the Lord are verily and indeed taken,” &c., while in one of her articles, she denied transubstantiation.

The answer, of course, was—There is a wide difference between the words “real” and “corporal.” There is no inconsistency whatever in the doctrine of the Church of England. She denies a “corporal,” and maintains a “real” presence in the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper. She specifically mentions and condemns *that form*, or phase of a *corporal* presence, known as the doctrine of transubstantiation, which is the most absurd and inconceivable of all modes of a “corporal” presence.

Again Mr. Gretton sought to fix another inconsistency on the Church of England, because she allows the Church to be a witness or keeper of Holy Scripture, and yet denies her infallibility. It was not clear whether he meant this as an inconsistency, or as an error in doctrine.

In either case, the reply was plain. The assertions of the Church relate to different things. In the one article the Church of England speaks of the Church as a witness to the canon of Scripture, whereas, Mr. G. spoke of her infallibility as an interpreter of it. The credit of the Church at large, as a witness testifying to a matter of fact, was a very different thing from the claim of a section of that Church to infallibility as an interpreter. The Church of England did not assert the testimony to be infallible. When she denied the interpretation to be so, there was neither inconsistency nor error.

Mr. G. then spoke of the absolution services, and maintained that the Church of England held and denied the

doctrine of the Church of Rome. The reply is too well known to be repeated. Your readers can see from these objections how little force there is in the charge of inconsistency made against the Church of England.

I proposed to take the peculiar doctrines of the Church *seriatim*, and discuss them either in the *CATHOLIC LAYMAN*, or in an accredited French paper. I said I was ready to go through the controversy, if Mr. Gretton, and his friends, would accept the proposal. Written controversy would induce caution of statement. Every proposal was declined.

I have to add, that I was aware fully, ere I undertook this discussion, of its hopelessness to all human judgment; the young lady being quite satisfied of the truth of the doctrines of the Church of Rome. But no matter how hopeless to human view may be the expectation of a good result in any such like case, I trust I shall ever be ready to undertake it, when it is in my power to do so. Were another case of the same character to occur, I would do as I have done in this, and commit the result to God, whose strength is made perfect in weakness. I did, however, expect in this discussion to do what I was sure I could do, and so declared—namely, to show that it was impossible for any Roman Catholic controversialist to defend his faith without resorting to the defence of irrelevancies and subterfuges; that the true point at issue was ever evaded, and that the effort always was to hide the disingenuity of defence; and that the religion which not only required such unworthy defences, but could, moreover, blind men of natural truth and candour to so much dishonesty as to make them employ it without. I have no doubt, in many cases, seeing its criminality, could never be the religion of Christ Jesus, which, by *manifestation of truth*, commends itself to the conscience of men. Whether I have done this, the readers of your paper are, perhaps, among the best judges in the world.

I have now only to account for the undue share of space which I have made my own arguments to occupy.

I had offered—the offer was repeated by a friend—that each party should write out his own arguments, and, on mutual correction, the whole should be published. This was refused. My opponents published an account quite different from the real facts, not only without allowing me to see the MSS., but against the remonstrance of a friend, who, on learning the purpose, offered, on my part, to give every facility to a true publication.

This report of my opponents I have, and from it I have taken their arguments, so far as they have been there given. The form is condensed; the argument being merely stated.

Each man is familiar with his own mode of stating things. I had long been used to one way of conducting the argument against infallibility. I could remember my own form of statement, even to the words. I could not do the same for my opponents. Hence, in order to secure verbal fairness, I was anxious they should write out their case, and allow me to do the same for mine; this being refused, I had no option but to state my own arguments in my own way, giving those of my opponents from their condensed account, and from my own notes. Hence, the disproportionate length which I have given to myself.

I am, dear Sir,  
Very truly Yours,  
EDW. B. MOERAN, D.D.

## Correspondence.

### INFALLIBILITY OF THE CHURCH.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—Agreeably to my promise, I now bring forward other passages from the Sacred Volume which demonstratively prove the infallibility of the Church. I affectionately call the attention of your truth-seeking and common-sense readers to those very plain and convincing passages. In our Lord’s last discourse with his apostles He thus addresses them—“All power is given to me in heaven and in earth. Going, therefore, teach ye all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and, behold, I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world.”—St. Matt. xxviii. 18, 19, 20. It is plain that the apostles were not to live unto the end of the world, and, hence, their successors must be implied in the promise. It is equally plain, that if Jesus Christ be with them to the consummation of ages, they cannot fall into error against faith.

We read in St. Matthew (xviii. 17) these words—“And if he will not hear the Church, let him be to thee as the heathen and publican.” From this, I think, it undeniably follows that a Church exists, that we are bound to hear her under pain of damnation, and that we would not be commanded to listen to her voice under such a grievous penalty, unless it were impossible for her to lead us into error, since it would be unreasonable to condemn us for not believing a seducer. The meaning which you, Mr. Editor, attach to this passage reminds me of the verse—

“By various texts we both uphold our claim—  
Nay, often ground our titles on the same:  
After long labour lost, and time’s expense,  
Both grant the words, and quarrel for the sense.”

\* A gentleman present at this discussion has published, at Boulogne, an able letter upon it; he declares therein that, upon remonstrating with Mr. Gretton afterwards upon the manner in which he had brought the controversy to its abrupt conclusion, that gentleman admitted to him “it was a trick.”